DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 931 JC 970 249

AUTHOR Walker, Ronald Edgar
TITLE Clinical Supervision in the Junior College.
PUB DATE Jan 97
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, January 23-25, 1997).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Clinical Supervision (of Teachers); *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Models; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Improvement; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Goldhammer Clinical Supervision Model

ABSTRACT

Within this century, junior and community colleges in the United States have created a new link in the educational chain between secondary schools and universities. As a result, faculty members at junior colleges have been "created" in that they are often former secondary school teachers, university professors, or graduate students who have little if any teaching experience. The complex make-up of the junior college faculty creates new challenges for department chairs using clinical supervision at the junior college level. In 1969, the Goldhammer Clinical Supervision Model was developed, which included the following five stages: a pre-observation conference, classroom observation, analysis of findings and strategy formation, the teacher-supervisor conference, and a post-conference analysis. Although this clinical supervision model can be effectively implemented in a junior college setting, the diverse make-up of faculty can complicate the process and require modifications by the supervisor prior to beginning clinical supervision. For example, former high school teachers may bring resentment from past supervision experiences to the process, graduate students may have very little formal training in educational techniques, and university professors may not be accustomed to supervision at all. Contains 13 references. Appendixes provide the Goldhammer model and a sample faculty assessment instrument. (HAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 931

Running head: CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Clinical Supervision in the Junior College

Ronald Edgar Walker

The University of Southern Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. E. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, January 23-25, 1997, Austin, Texas

JC 970 249

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Within this century, the junior and community colleges of America have created a new link in this nation's educational chain between the secondary schools and the universities. As a result, faculty members at junior colleges have been "created" in a sense by employing former secondary school teachers, university professors, and graduate students with little if any teaching experience. Therefore, the complex make-up of the junior college faculty creates a new challenge for the chairperson who uses clinical supervision on the junior college level. However, with careful adherence to faculty types and a proven model of clinical supervision (such as Goldhammer's), clinical supervision on the junior college level can be effectively administered.

Clinical Supervision in the Junior College

Since the beginning of the junior college movement in America early in this century, the modern junior college has undergone numerous changes in order to meet the ever-changing and diverse needs of its students. As a result, varying state and local needs and demands have created an American system of junior and community colleges in which each is unique and therefore different in governance, policy, articulation, course offerings, and the like.

In addition, the identity of faculty of junior or community colleges has become quite diverse and even difficult to classify between the traditionally-accepted roles and characteristics of secondary school teachers and university professors. Cohen and Brawer (1972) note that "the junior college instructor, operating somewhere between the secondary school teacher and the university professor, is in a particularly ambivalent position" (p. 12).

Also, the placement of junior college instructors on organizational charts can differ from one junior college to another. For instance, some junior college instructors are supervised exclusively by the academic dean or dean of the college (Tisdale, 1996). Usually, however, a division chairperson, as Richardson (1972) suggests, is the primary liaison between the administrative structure and faculty of a division. Sometimes, the chairperson becomes the mid-point in disputes between faculty and the administration. However, Zoglin (1976) says that many junior

colleges have given full control of instruction decision-making to the division chairperson and faculty.

Consequently, because all secondary school, junior college, and university faculties are not exactly alike, it is difficult to accurately typify what each of the three faculties mentioned above are or should be. However, many junior college faculties are governed by policies that share characteristics with both secondary school and university faculties. As a result, any clinical supervision model to be used on a junior college faculty may very well require special consideration on the part of the supervisor based on the type of faculty found on a particular campus.

Categorizing Junior College Instructors

Friedman (1965, 1967) conducted a study among instructors in four midwestern community colleges. As a result, he classified faculty members into three general categories: "High Schoolers," "Profs," and "Grad Students." He created the above headings based on the instructors' previous institutional experiences.

First, Friedman (1967) examined the "High Schoolers." This type has previously taught in a secondary school for five years or more and considers teaching at a junior college a promotion in educational career status. They usually bring with them a devotion to a particular subject and enjoy conveying knowledge in class. The "High Schooler" usually resists policy emanating from administrators with an "educational viewpoint" also.

Friedman further notes that this type of junior college instructor usually resists most educational intrusions (such as self-study participation).

Second, Friedman (1967) typifies the "Grad Students." These are on their first teaching experiences after graduate school. They hold the Master's or Doctoral Degree but usually have little if any teaching experience. These instructors have an excitement for their knowledge in specialized areas but have to downsize their teachings to fit freshman courses, which they usually teach. Many in this group see the junior college teaching experience as a professional level which will soon lead to another career or further study: law school, higher education, etc.

Finally, Friedman (1967) describes junior college faculty members who are former college professors--"Profs." These people usually enjoy teaching lower-level courses and bring with them knowledge which was acquired and taught in a university research atmosphere. Many of these teachers adjust well; however, others view the post-university job at a junior college as a demotion.

The Goldhammer Clinical Supervision Model

Having considered Friedman's (1967) logic in classifying junior college instructors, one can examine a clinical supervision model, for instance that of Dr. Robert Goldhammer (1969), and determine its effectiveness on a junior college campus. The stages of the Goldhammer clinical supervision model are listed in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE.

Before any clinical supervision model is chosen, a supervisor must analyze the types of individuals being supervised and adjust accordingly. However, for this analysis, Friedman's (1967) types of junior college instructors will be examined using the model of Goldhammer (1969).

Type: High Schooler

Stage 1: Preobservation Conference

During stage 1 of the Goldhammer model, the supervisor, usually a departmental chair, should make a sincere effort to remove any resentment the supervisee may bring into the office concerning past supervision experiences at previous schools. For example, a particular "High Schooler" type may resent a former supervisor and may react in a defensive manner from the very beginning of a preobservation conference. Therefore, the supervisor must keep this possibility in mind as well as create a receptive, cordial, honest, and sincere form of communication.

One possible goal might be for the teacher to concentrate on what his or her strengths and weaknesses are in teaching students from age 18 and beyond and how the instructor interacts with adults in a classroom setting (as opposed to the interaction with children below college level).

High Schooler

Stage 2: Observation

During the junior college chairperson's visit to the instructor's classroom, the chairperson must be aware of factors which may readily affect the observation experience. First,

Marks (1978) suggests that the "supervisory visit should focus on all elements of the teaching-learning situation, not merely on the teacher" (p. 212). Therefore, the supervisor should be observant of the overall classroom activities, but remain committed to observing the area or areas jointly discussed with the teacher during the preobservation conference.

High Schooler

Stage 3: Analysis and Strategy

The supervisor during stage three should reflect upon the data collected during the observation. However, at this point a problem may arise if the supervisor is experienced in educational theory and the instructor is not. In that case, the supervisor must approach suggestions for the conference in an explanatory, positive, and non-punitive manner. The chair must also remember that the instructor of this category may be resistant to theory and, thus, resist assistance or suggestions.

High Schooler

Stage 4: Conference

The conference for the "High Schooler" type of junior college instructor can be effective if the instructor senses a partnership of support rather than an enemy attack. Since the conference is between two junior college employees, both with at least the master's degree, a more congenial, cooperative meeting should occur if the supervisor truly understands the purpose of the conference. Although both parties may hold equal degrees, the supervisee can still become defensive if the

conference carries a tone of demands, assumptions, misunderstandings, and the like. On the junior college level, the actual conference with the high schooler type can be very effective, especially if the teacher is new to the junior college scene and the supervisor maintains objective, informative suggestions and support to help the former secondary school teacher become more involved and effective at the junior college level.

High Schooler

Stage 5: Post-Conference Analysis

During the post-conference analysis, the chairperson has a good opportunity to reflect upon the instructor's reaction to the discussion during the conference. Goldhammer (1969) suggests that a tape recording be used in the conference so that one can review the vocal responses and comments of both the supervisor and the instructor.

In addition, notes taken during the conference can help the supervisor plan and analyze his or her next move if further stages are to be added or repeated later in the school year. Finally, a survey of the chairperson's performance can be given to the instructor to obtain feedback from the instructor's perspective on how well the chairperson performs duties and responsibilities (see Table 2). This reversal of observation and reflection can help the chair determine how effective he or she is perceived by the faculty and makes the "High Schooler" type feel more involved in departmental operations and progress. In turn, the response survey may help eliminate the "High Schooler's"

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE.

resentment of the clinical supervision process, which seems to have followed him or her from the secondary school to the junior college, if negatives still exist.

Grad Students

Stage 1: Preobservation Conference

For teachers on the junior college campus who were hired with no prior teaching experience on the secondary or primary levels, the supervisor must first be conscious of some basic issues before the preobservation conference begins. First, the supervisor must recognize that many of these instructors majored in a specific field and many have not been exposed to educational courses during college.

Therefore, the supervisor must very thoroughly explain what clinical supervision is and how it can benefit the instructor. Second, as Marks (1978) notes, "Inexperienced teachers are not always certain as to what constitutes acceptable standards of work and behavior in the various learning situations" (p. 185). As a result, these neophytes may view clinical supervision in the preobservation conference as confusing and as something they do not need. If this occurs, the chairperson as supervisor must approach these teachers carefully, cordially, and quickly before serious misconceptions of clinical supervision begin to surface. After explaining the clinical supervision process thoroughly to the "Grad Student" teacher, the supervisor may work with the teacher to set as a goal the avoidance of lecturing, as the "Grad Student" probably experienced during his or her college

courses, and seek cooperative learning and discussions as possible additions to or replacements of classroom lectures.

Grad Students

Stage 2: Observation

In observing the "Grad Student" type of junior college instructor, the supervisor may find that the lecture is the most common form of classroom delivery. As a result, the supervisor should not be shocked to witness an entire class period of lecturing from the instructor, note-taking from the students, and only occasional questions from students. Even if the goal in the preobservation conference were to reduce lecture time, the lecture for the "Grad Student" may dominate due to the lack of experience from the instructor in other modes of teaching. If this situation occurs, the observation may be difficult to analyze until the supervisor has reached the next phase in Goldhammer's model of clinical supervision.

Grad Students

Stage 3: Analysis and Strategy

If the two (instructor and supervisor) have communicated well in the preobservation conference, the instructor should have known what the supervisor would be looking for in the observation. However, the lecture style for an inexperienced teacher is sometimes difficult to overcome. Likewise, it may be difficult for the observer to take notes for the clinical supervision process when lecture dominates the hour. Therefore, the supervisor should develop a strategy to be brought out in the

supervision conference which would assist in developing and introducing new or different approaches to lecture-oriented courses and instructors.

Grad Students

Stage 4: Supervision Conference

In this conference the supervisor should be prepared to encourage other approaches besides lectures for the instructor's delivery style. O'Banion (1989) offers three suggestions for making lectures more effective:

1. prepare mini-lectures or break long lectures into 5 to 15 minute presentations;
2. give the mini-lectures only on student demand; and
3. create a demand for the mini-lectures. (p. 51)

Then, some ways to "create a demand" for the mini-lectures are given:

1. provide handouts outlining important content and questions before class begins;
2. ask what questions on the handout would be most difficult to answer on a test;
3. write requests on the board until there is a starting place for a mini-lecture;
4. ask students to give input in answering the questions;
5. avoid giving answers but guide students to a correct response;
6. when the correct responses or answers are given, begin the mini-lecture. (pp. 51-52)

Most likely, if these or similar suggestions are made to the "Grad Student" teacher, he or she will respond positively and will probably agree to try the techniques. Although some may resist, most of these instructors can very well remember their classes when they were in college and can reflect on the many ineffective lectures they had to endure.

Grad Students

Stage 5: Post-conference Analysis

For the post-conference analysis, the supervisor would probably benefit more from an audio or video-taped conversation during the conference. Hart (1982) suggests using audiotapes in an early supervisory session (preobservation conference) and videotapes in a later session (post-observation conference). He makes these suggestions based on the assumption that instructors will be more relaxed and more confident (or relieved) following the initial meeting and, therefore, the later video will be made after initial fears and anxiety are lessened or gone. Hence, the supervisor, having suggested that lectures be modified, can retrieve a more accurate response from the instructor through audio and video means than by relying on notes and memory.

Profs

Stage 1: Preobservation Conference

In the preobservation conference for "Profs," the supervisor must realize that these instructors have come from a much less supervised environment and are firmly set in their ways of teaching. However, the supervisor must consider reminding the

"Profs" that a junior college is very instruction-oriented and that university and college classroom procedures may not be as effective on the junior college level. For example, if a research paper is assigned at the university, the professor may not feel it necessary to designate several days of classroom time covering the fundamentals for using APA style. On the other hand, the junior college instructor may find this unit completely necessary.

If the supervisor tries to merely inform the "Prof" how to teach, the purpose of the preobservation conference has thus been defeated. One could, however, remind the "Prof" that more innovative instruction and cooperative learning (but less researching and lecturing) are recommended. Then, the goal of the meeting can be to ask questions and volunteer assistance if some students do not understand a concept rather than assuming they can research and find the answers themselves.

Also, Hart (1982) provides suggestions which would work well for the preobservation conference with senior teachers. He suggests that supervisors ask advice, show respect, and solicit the "Prof's" prior experience in building departmental strength. These approaches may very well create a renaissance of pride and confidence in a teacher who otherwise may feel demoted, unmotivated, and ready for retirement.

Profs

Stage 2: Observation

As with the "Grad Student" types of junior college instructors, the "Profs" also may be most comfortable with the lecture mode of

classroom instruction. Therefore, the supervisor should expect this in advance and, as stated previously in the "Grad Student" section, discuss possible alternatives beforehand. Also, the supervisor should remember that this type of instructor from the university is not used to a supervisor actually sitting in the classroom. The atmosphere during the observation may even be cold as the "Prof" is being observed by "someone who has never taught on the university level."

Profs

Stage 3: Analysis and Strategy

After the observation is over, the supervisor may analyze the notes thus recorded and may use the technique of selective verbatim as suggested by Acheson and Gall (1992) in preparing notes for the supervision conference. By using selective verbatim, the supervisor can more objectively suggest areas of change or modifications which may work better on the junior college level. Also, selective verbatim may help the senior "Prof" more clearly realize those characteristics that through time and repetition at the university, such as lecturing, have become deeply embedded.

Profs

Stage 4: Supervision Conference

At the supervision conference, the "Profs" may actually be getting tired of the clinical supervision process; however, this conference can be a chance not only to suggest and collaborate on the classroom performance but also to revive a sense of

accomplishment and pride into one who may previously have been set for an easy job until retirement.

Some resistance and negative feedback may occur, but usually this person will even offer suggestions beyond those the supervisor mentions. Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) note that teachers respond well to assistance, inclusion, courtesy, respect, and opportunities for professional growth; and junior college teachers who are former college professors need these areas reinforced to help rebuild confidence and self-esteem, especially if they see junior college as a professional demotion. As a result of an encouraging conference, the "Prof" may once again become a contributing member of a faculty, not one waiting for a final day of service in the classroom.

Profs

Stage 5: Post-Conference Analysis

Lucio and McNeil (1962) suggest that few people "welcome confusion and unsolved problems," and "it is often easier and certainly more comfortable to justify things as they are, to deny the need to change, to use ready-made prescriptions or to fall back on personal anecdotes or testimonials" (p. 235). All of these examples may be present in the minds of junior college instructors who are former professors from a university. In the Post-conference analysis, the supervisor should carefully search for signs of these negative ideals which may have been carefully hidden by the teacher throughout the previous stages. A video or audio tape would be most valuable in analyzing the

effectiveness of Goldhammer's clinical supervision model on the former professors who now teach at a junior college.

Conclusions

The clinical supervision model suggested by Goldhammer (1969) can be effectively implemented in a junior college setting. The diverse make-up of a junior college faculty, however, can complicate the process and require additional thought and classification of faculty types by the supervisor prior to beginning clinical supervision.

Friedman's (1967) categories are general and were derived based on the faculty of only four junior colleges. However, since most degree requirements for junior college faculty members are consistent nationwide, Friedman's categories do provide a convenient and fairly accurate framework to analyze the approaches a supervisor should consider prior to and during clinical supervision in a junior college.

The "High Schoolers," "Grad Students," and "Profs" can be effectively supervised by junior college division chairs using Goldhammer's model if careful consideration is given to the past experiences of each faculty member, if the cooperation and support from the supervisor is evident, and if the process of clinical supervision is understood and followed by all involved.

References

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1992). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1972). Confronting identity: The community college instructor. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Friedman, N. L. (1967). Career stages and organizational role decisions of teachers in two-year public junior colleges. Sociology of Education, 40, 231-245.

Friedman, N. L. (1965). The public junior college teacher in unified public school system junior colleges: A study in the sociology of educational work. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hart, G. M. (1982). The process of clinical supervision. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1969). Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marks, J. R., Stoops, E., & King-Stoops, J. (1978). Handbook of educational supervision: A guide for the practitioner (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

O'Banion, T. (1989). Innovation in the community college. New York: Macmillan.

Richardson, R. C., Blocker, C. E., & Bender, L. W. (1972). Governance for the two-year college. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. (1973). The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Dodd, Mead.

Tisdale, T. T. (1996). Personal interview. President of Jones County Junior College, Ellisville, MS.

Zoglin, M. L. (1976). Power and politics in the community college. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.

Table 1

Goldhammer's Clinical Supervision Stages

Stage One	Preobservation Conference
Stage Two	Observation
Stage Three	Analysis and Strategy
Stage Four	Supervision and Conference
Stage Five	Post-Conference Analysis

CHAIRPERSON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT
Jones County Junior College
Ellisville, Mississippi 39437

Based upon duties and responsibilities outlined in the Policy and Procedure Manual for Jones Junior College.

Division: _____ Chairperson: _____

Directions: Using the following code, mark the number on the Scantron form which best represents your assessment of each evaluation criterion of your division chairperson.

5 = Superior 4 = Commendable 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Marginal
1 = Unacceptable

==========

1. Informs faculty members within the division regarding institutional policies and procedures.
2. Provides the faculty with assistance in acquiring necessary materials, supplies, and equipment.
3. Is available for conference and assistance during posted office hours.
4. Is familiar with the objectives and curriculum of the educational program.
5. Emphasizes curriculum development and instructional improvement.
6. Demonstrates decision-making skills in departmental administrative matters.
7. Observes program operation within the department to be in a position to offer appropriate assistance.
8. Seeks and uses suggestions from faculty relating to program improvement and department budget.
9. Consults with faculty about departmental decisions and school decisions/policy affecting instructional assignments.
10. Commends exemplary accomplishments of personnel.
11. Demonstrates consistency in interpersonal professional relationship with personnel.
12. Demonstrates fairness in dealing with all department personnel.
13. Demonstrates an attitude of enthusiasm for the educational program.
14. Completes periodic evaluations with departmental personnel.
15. Demonstrates the ability to handle fiscal responsibility in departmental business.
16. Participates in orientation of new faculty.
17. Conducts weekly divisional meetings.